

REMARKS

Applicant adds claims 19 and 20. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claim rejections

Claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bianchi et al. (US Publication No. 2003/0117499, hereinafter “Bianchi”) and further in view of Herrod et al. (US Patent No. 6,405,049, hereinafter “Herrod”). Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bianchi and further in view of Herrod and Kuroiwa et al. (US Patent No. 5,715,020, hereinafter “Kuroiwa”). Applicant traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “said operation code being sent so as to put said external display means in an external input condition, under which the image is able to be displayed, when said digital camera placed in said cradle unit selects said external display mode.”

The Examiner admits that Bianchi does not disclose the unique feature of claim 1 recited above, but asserts that Herrod discloses the features missing in Bianchi. Applicant submits that the Examiner is misinterpreting the teachings of Herrod at least for the following reasons.

Herrod

Herrod is directed to a portable device system that includes a portable data device and a cradle for receiving the portable data device. Herrod discloses a portable terminal 10 arranged to

interface with a cradle 12 via physical connection. The portable terminal 10 is inserted into a recess 14 in the cradle 12. The cradle 12 is connected with a host 15 which is a stand-alone computer or part of an internet (FIG. 1 and column 5, lines 33-40). The terminal device 10 can be a CRT type television display or a flat panel LCD type display (column 6, lines 6-10) and the cradle interface 28 in cradle unit 12 allows downloading of data stored in the terminal 10 to the cradle and transfer of control or other data from the cradle to the terminal 10 (column 6, lines 30-32).

However, Herrod does not disclose the operation code being sent so as to put the external display means in an external input condition, under which the image is able to be displayed, when the digital camera placed in the cradle unit selects the external display mode

In particular, Herrod discloses that a CRT display (alleged external display means) is inserted into cradle 12 and does not disclose a **digital camera placed in the cradle unit**. Consequently, Herrod does not disclose the condition of “**when said digital camera placed in said cradle unit selects said external display mode**”. Therefore, sharing of the data between the CRT display (the alleged external display means) and its corresponding cradle 12 disclosed in Herrod is not based on the digital camera selecting the external display mode.

In addition, Herrod merely discloses a transfer of control data from the cradle 12 to the CRT display (terminal device 10) (column 6, lines 30-33). However, transferring control data does not disclose **sending operation code to the external display means to put the external display means in an external input condition**, when the display camera placed in the cradle unit selects the external display mode.

Applicant also submits that, since the CRT display is inserted into cradle 12 and is considered to be a part of and internal to the terminal-cradle system, Herrod does not disclose an **external** display means as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious to modify the teachings of Bianchi with the teachings of Herrod at least for the following reasons.

The Examiner indicates in page 4, paragraph 3 of the Office Action, that

“it would have been obvious to an artisan to incorporate the operation-code generator and transmitter as described by Herrod into the digital system as describe by Bianchi in order to remotely control the television under the external input condition in a infrared manner because such incorporation not only eliminates the burden to physically touch control buttons of the TV but also results in a simple circuit for infrared transmission which lowers product costs and power consumptions.”

Bianchi

Bianchi is directed to a docking station that enables wireless remote control of digital image capture device docked thereon. Bianchi discloses a docking station 14 which receives command from a user generated **using a remote controller** 46. In response to the received command, the docking station communicates with the digital image capture device and the digital image capture device sends information to be displayed on television (page 4, paragraphs [0055] and [0056]).

Furthermore, Bianchi discloses that the docking cradle 200 (docking station 14) includes a receiver 210 (e.g., **and IR receiver or and RF receiver**) that receives commands (e.g., **IR commands or RF commands**) transmitted by the wireless remote control 46 (page 3, paragraph [0040]).

Therefore, it is clear that Bianchi discloses using an infrared remote controller, which allows the user to control what is being displayed on the television, through the docking station and the digital image capture device. Therefore, it would not be necessary to modify the teachings of Bianchi with the teachings of Herrod to incorporate a feature that is already disclosed in Bianchi.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the Examiner proposed combination of the cited references.

Claim 18

Applicant submits that claim 18 recites subject matter analogous to claim 1, and therefore should be allowable for at least similar reasons claim 1 is shown to be allowable.

Claims 2-5

Applicant submits that since claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, and since Kuroiwa does not cure the deficiency noted above with respect to claim 1, claims 2-5 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

New claims

Applicant submits that new claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 1, and therefore should be allowable by virtue of its dependency and additional limitation thereof.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Susan Pering Pan
Registration No. 41,239

Date: October 17, 2007